

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
BEAUMONT DIVISION**

REA AND AMBER WRINKLE

Plaintiff,

v.

**SCOTTSDALE INSURANCE
COMPANY,**

Defendant.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

**CIVIL ACTION NO. 1:19-cv-00191
JURY**

SCOTTSDALE INSURANCE COMPANY'S NOTICE OF REMOVAL

Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 and 1446, Defendant SCOTTSDALE INSURANCE COMPANY ("Scottsdale") files its Notice of Removal to the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Texas, Beaumont Division, on the basis of diversity of citizenship, and amount in controversy, and respectfully shows the following:

I. PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

1. On March 8, 2019, Plaintiffs Rea and Amber Wrinkle ("Wrinkle" or "Plaintiffs") filed their Original Petition in a case styled *Rea and Amber Wrinkle v. Scottsdale Insurance Company*; Cause No. B190080-D, pending in the 163rd Judicial District Court, Orange County, Texas.

2. Scottsdale received a copy of the Plaintiffs' Original Petition on or about March 25, 2019.

3. Scottsdale files this notice of removal within 30 days of receiving Plaintiffs' Original Petition. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b). This Notice of Removal is being filed within one year of the commencement of this action. *see id.*

4. All pleadings, process, orders, and other filings in the state court action are attached to this Notice as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(a).

5. Attached hereto are copies of the following documents:

- **Exhibit 1:** Plaintiffs' Original Petition
- **Exhibit 2:** Defendant Scottsdale Insurance Company's Original Answer to Plaintiffs' Original Petition
- **Exhibit 3:** List of Parties and Counsel and Other Information

II. BASES FOR REMOVAL

6. Removal is proper based on diversity of citizenship under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1332(a)(1), 1441(a), and 1446.

A. Plaintiffs and Defendant Scottsdale are diverse.

7. **Plaintiffs** Rea and Amber Wrinkle are individuals residing in Orange County, Texas.

8. **Defendant** Scottsdale Insurance Company is incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio, with its principal place of business in Scottsdale, Arizona. Scottsdale is therefore not a citizen of the State of Texas for diversity purposes.

9. Thus, this lawsuit is between citizens of different states, and there is complete diversity of citizenship between Plaintiffs and Scottsdale.

B. The Amount in Controversy Exceeds the Jurisdictional Requirements for Subject Matter Jurisdiction.

10. In determining the amount in controversy, the court may consider "policy limits... penalties, statutory damages, and punitive damages." *St. Paul Reinsurance Co., Ltd. v. Greenberg*, 134 F.3d 1250, 1253 (5th Cir. 1998); *see Ray v. State Farm Lloyds*, No. CIV.A.3:98-CV-1288-G, 1999 WL 151667, at * 2-3 (N.D. Tex. Mar. 10, 1999) (finding a sufficient amount in controversy in plaintiff's case against their insurance company for breach of contract, fraud,

negligence, gross negligence, bad faith, violations of the Texas Insurance Code, violations of the Texas Deceptive Trade Practices Act, and mental anguish); *Fairmont Travel, Inc. v. George S. May Int'l Co.*, 75 F. Supp.2d 666, 668 (S.D. Tex. 1999) (considering DTPA claims and the potential for recovery of punitive damages for the amount in controversy determination); *Chittick v. Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 844 F. Supp. 1153, 1155 (S.D. Tex. 1994) (finding a sufficient amount in controversy after considering the nature of the claims, the types of damages sought and the presumed net worth of the defendant in a claim brought by the insureds against their insurance company for actual and punitive damages arising from a claim they made for roof damages).

11. This is a civil action in which the claim for relief in Paragraph 7 of Plaintiffs' petition indicates Plaintiffs are "seeking monetary relief over \$100,000 but not more than \$200,000." Plaintiffs allege that defendant is liable under a residential insurance policy because Plaintiffs made claims under that policy and defendant wrongfully adjusted and underpaid Plaintiffs' claims. This demonstrates that the amount in controversy in this case exceeds the jurisdictional requirements.

III. THIS REMOVAL IS PROCEDURALLY CORRECT

12. Scottsdale received a copy of this lawsuit on March 25, 2019. Thus, Scottsdale is filing this Notice within the 30-day time period required by 28 U.S.C. § 1446(b).

13. Venue is proper in this District and Division under 28 U.S.C. §1446(a) because i) this District and Division include the county in which the state action has been pending, and ii) a substantial part of the events giving rise to Plaintiffs' claims allegedly occurred in this District and Division.

14. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1446(a), all pleadings, process, orders, and all other filings in the state court action are attached to this Notice.

15. Promptly after Scottsdale files this Notice of Removal, written notice of the filing will be given to Plaintiffs pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1446(d).

16. Promptly after Scottsdale files this Notice of Removal, a true and correct copy of same will be filed with the District Clerk of the Orange County District Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1446(d).

IV. CONCLUSION

17. Based upon the foregoing, the exhibits submitted in support of this removal, and other documents filed contemporaneously with this Notice of Removal, Defendant Scottsdale Insurance Company hereby removes this case to this Court for trial and determination.

Respectfully submitted,

THOMPSON, COE, COUSINS & IRONS, L.L.P.

By: /s/ George Arnold

George H. Arnold, *Attorney-in-Charge*

State Bar No. 00783559

garnold@thompsoncoe.com

Susan Sparks Usery

State Bar No. 18880100

susery@thompsoncoe.com

One Riverway, Suite 1400

Houston, Texas 77056

Telephone: (713) 403-8210

Facsimile: (713) 403-8299

**ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANT
SCOTTSDALE INSURANCE COMPANY**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on April 19, 2019, a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument was delivered to all known counsel of record in accordance with the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, and any applicable Local Rules, as follows:

John Cash Smith
Christopher S. Smith
SMITH LAW FIRM, PLLC
1006 Green Ave.
Orange, TX 77630
johncash@smithlawfirmtx.com
chris@smithlawfirmtx.com
Attorneys for Plaintiff

/s/ George Arnold
George H. Arnold